



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/541,215 | 06/30/2005 | Shinji Hamai | 2005_1027A | 4866 |
| 513 | 7590 | 03/03/2009 | | |
| WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. | | | EXAMINER | |
| 1030 15th Street, N.W., | | | POPHAM, JEFFREY D | |
| Suite 400 East | | | | |
| Washington, DC 20005-1503 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2437 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 03/03/2009 | PAPER |
| | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | | Application No. 10/541,215 | Applicant(s) HAMAI, SHINJI |
| | | Examiner JEFFREY D. POPHAM | Art Unit 2437 |
| <p>– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –</p> <p>THE REPLY FILED 18 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.</p> <p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</p> <p>a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p> <p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p> <p>NOTICE OF APPEAL</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).</p> <p>AMENDMENTS</p> <p>3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because</p> <p>(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(c) <input type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</p> <p>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</p> <p>NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).</p> <p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</p> <p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____. </p> <p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p> <p>7. <input type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) <input type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or b) <input type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: _____. Claim(s) objected to: _____. Claim(s) rejected: _____. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____. </p> <p>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</p> <p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</p> <p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).</p> <p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.</p> <p>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</p> <p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></p> <p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached <i>Information Disclosure Statement(s)</i>. (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____</p> <p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. </p> <p>/Jeffrey D Popham/ Examiner, Art Unit 2437</p> <p>/Minh Dieu Nguyen/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2437</p> | | | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments to independent claims 1, 13, 14, and 16 change the scope of the claims and would require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant provides the same general arguments as were provided in the remarks dated 8/12/2008, already responded to in the final office action dated 11/18/2008. Applicant has changed this argument in 1 aspect, however, in that Applicant argues that "Naor merely teaches that the CRL is not used when (i) the time stamp is older than a current time stamp or (ii) the expiration period of expired". As explicitly pointed out in a citation cited in the final office action, "certificates are marked by a serial number instead of an expiration date." One can clearly see that the serial number is used here. Applicant argues, with respect to claim 8, that Naor fails to disclose or suggest updating a revocation number to a number that is larger than an identification number of a server certificate to be revoked and issuing a new server certificate including an identification number indicating a value that is equal to or larger than the revocation number. The pertinent portion reads "Kaufman et al. [15, Section 7.7.3] suggested reissuing all certificates whenever the CRL grows beyond some limit. In their proposal, certificates are marked by a serial number instead of an expiration date. (Serial numbers are incremented for each issues certificate. Serial numbers are not reused even when all certificates are reissued.) The CRL contains a field indicating the first valid certificate. When all certificates are reissued, the CRL first valid certificate field is updated to contain the serial number of the first reissued certificate." One can clearly see here an identification number (serial number) that is compared against a first valid certificate (revocation number), wherein IDs smaller than the first valid certificate are invalid/revoke/non-reissued, and IDs equal to or larger than the first valid certificate are valid. One can further see the reissuance of valid certificates, wherein such reissued certificates contain serial numbers equal to or larger than the first valid certificate.